

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated June 8, 2010, the Examiner rejected claims 17-25, 27-30, 32-43 and 59-83. Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection in light of the following discussion.

Referring to claim 17, the claim recites the step of manually feeding a document to an imaging station by dropping the extracted documents toward a transport. Clearly nothing in Stevens '273 teaches or suggests the steps of extracting the documents and dropping the extracted documents toward a transport. Furthermore, nothing in Robertson '471 teaches or suggests the step of dropping extracted documents. In Robertson '471 the device drops an envelope into a shuttle. By dropping the envelope, the documents are edge-justified against the bottom of the envelope. The envelope is then conveyed so that the top edge of the envelope is severed. By dropping the envelope, the system minimizes the chance that the documents in the envelope will be cut when the top edge of the envelope is cut. Obviously, once the documents are extracted from the envelope, the purpose for dropping the documents into the shuttle is eliminated.

Accordingly, since neither Robertson nor Stevens '273 teach or suggest dropping extracted documents toward a transport, claim 17 is patentable over the references. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claim 17 and dependent claims 18-24.

With respect to the remaining rejections, the rejections rely on mixing and matching various elements of different references simply because they relate to document processing. The Examiner seems to believe that any feature from a manual system can simply be incorporated into a fully automated system. This simply isn't true. One of ordinary skill in the art would not look to a manual system such as disclosed in Robertson 6,230,471 to improve upon the features of a fully automated system as disclosed in Stevens '273. The Examiner views the changes as steps back in the art. That simply isn't true. The semi-automated systems such as disclosed in Robertson '471 are simply different fields from the systems in Stevens '273. They both

accomplish document processing, but they each have different places in the document processing industry. The problem with the Examiner's combination is that they combine features that one of ordinary skill in the art simply would never combine. For instance, the feature of stopping the forward advancement of the documents as recited in claim 36 and extracting the documents while the envelope simply would never be incorporated into the system in Stevens '273. To say that one of ordinary skill in the art would modify Stevens to have this feature is simply using Applicants' disclosure to try to find pieces in the art and pick and choose them to build the claimed system. Obviously, this is inappropriate.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant believes that this application is in form for allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney if the Examiner believes that issues remain regarding the allowability of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL & SKILLMAN
A Professional Corporation
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /Stephen H. Eland/
Stephen H. Eland
PTO Registration No. 41,010

Telephone: (215) 563-4100
Facsimile: (215) 563-4044